REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, 26-29, 34 and 35 are currently pending.
- Claims 8 and 19 are canceled herein.
- Claims 1, 13, 18 and 26-28 are amended herein.
- New claims 34 and 35 are added herein.

[0003]   Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13 and 26 is found in the originally filed specification, at least at pages 13 and 14. The amendments submitted herein do not include any new matter.

Cited Documents

[0004]   The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Yellepeddy**: Yellepeddy, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145003
- **Thatcher**: Thatcher et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,743

Yellepeddy Fails to Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 19, 20 and 26

[0005]   Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 19, 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yellepeddy. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Moreover, claims 8 and 19 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Independent Claims 1 and 26

[0006] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26 is moot. Claims 1 and 26 are amended to include a similar feature previously recited in dependent claim 8, and now recite in part, "_wherein the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces._"

[0007] In the rejection of claim 8, the Office states that Yellepeddy discloses that "the second namespace comprises a metadirectory," citing Paragraph [0060]. Office Action page 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Yellepeddy does not disclose "_a metadirectory_" as presently recited in claims 1 and 26, at least because Yellepeddy is directed toward preventing cluttering of the metadirectory, as discussed in Yellepeddy Paragraph [0060], reproduced for convenience (with emphasis):

> The basic join operation performed by the metadirectory (20) merges selected data items from each of these data sources to create an entry (21) in a local table for Mr. Kent. **Objects from data sources which are not merged or joined are filtered. This prevents cluttering the metadirectory with data items which are not commonly needed from the unified view of the metadirectory.** For example, the surname, first name, title, work telephone number and department from the HR database may be exported to the metadirectory, **filtering out the other attributes (employee number, date of hire, etc.).** Additionally, the user objects from the Novellware bindary may be exported to the metadirectory, while filtering out the routing tables for Mr. Kent.

[0008] Rather, the join operation in Yellepeddy is directed towards filtering out any data items that are not "commonly needed from the unified view of the metadirectory." For example, since an employee number and the date of hire are not data items needed

in other databases, there is no reason to clutter the metadirectory, according to Yellepeddy.

[0009]   Thus, Yellepeddy fails to disclose that "*the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces,*" as presently recited in claims 1 and 26.   Instead, Yellepeddy teaches away from such a feature because Yellepeddy describes merging only the necessary, common data items in a metadirectory.

[0010]   Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of these claims.   Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate these claims, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to modify Yellepeddy to include that "*the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces,*" since dong so would be contrary to the teachings of Yellepeddy.

Dependent Claim 2

[0011]   Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Yellepeddy, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, claim 2 is also allowable over the cited document of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Independent Claim 13

[0012]   In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 13 is moot. Claim 13 is amended to recite in part, "*wherein the central representation comprises an aggregation of information from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object, and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object.*"

[0013]   Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not disclose "*the central representation*" as recited in claim 13, at least because Yellepeddy is directed toward preventing cluttering of the metadirectory. As previously noted, the join operation in Yellepeddy is directed towards filtering out any data items that are not "commonly needed from the unified view of the metadirectory." Accordingly, any data item in Yellepeddy that is unique to a particular data source is filtered out and not associated with the metadirectory.

[0014]   Thus, Yellepeddy fails to disclose a "*central representation comprises an aggregation of all information from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object, and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object,*" as presently recited in claim 13.   Instead, Yellepeddy teaches away from such a feature because Yellepeddy describes merging only the necessary, common data items in a metadirectory.

[0015]   Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate these claims, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 20

[0016]   Claim 20 depends from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is not anticipated by Yellepeddy, and is therefore allowable over the cited document. Therefore, claim 20 is also allowable over the cited document of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25 and 27-29 Are Non-Obvious Over Yellepeddy in view of Thatcher

[0017]   Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yellepeddy in view of Thatcher. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least because Thatcher does not remedy the deficiencies in Yellepeddy as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 13 and 26, from which claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25 and 27-29 ultimately depend.

[0018]   Rather, Thatcher describes "provid[ing] a ***generic user interface*** in which a variety of namespaces can be integrated and accessed independent of the types of the namespaces." Thatcher, Column 2 Lines 12-15 (with emphasis). Thatcher does not teach or suggest that "*the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces,*" as presently recited in claims 1 and 26,

or a "*central representation comprises an aggregation of all information from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object, and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object,*" as presently recited in claim 13.

[0019]   Accordingly, claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, and 27-29 are allowable over Yellepeddy and Thatcher for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 13, and 26 are allowable over Yellepeddy and Thatcher.

New Claims

[0020]   Applicant has added new claims 34 and 35 herein, which depends from claims 1 and 26. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 34 and 35 further recite subject matter not disclosed or taught by the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests favorable examination of the newly added claims.

Conclusion

[0021]   For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0022]   If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

___/Jacob Rohwer 61229/_____   Dated:_____7/20/2010_____
Jacob Rohwer
(jacob@leehayes.com; 206-876-6004)
Registration No. 61229

Dave Divine
Registration No. 51275

Serial No.: 10/671,408   -16-   lee&hayes The Business of IP®
Atty Docket No.: MS1-1686US
Atty/Agent: Jacob Rohwer
                                                     www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256